

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 1, 2010. Claims 69-91 are presented for examination, of which Claims 69, 79, and 89 are in independent form. Claims 69, 70, 79, 80, 89, and 90 have been amended to define aspects of Applicants' invention more clearly. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, at page 36, lines 16-2, page 106, lines 17-26, and in FIG. 72.¹ Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claim 69, 79, and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended Claim 69, 79, and 89, as deemed necessary, to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in section 2 of the Office Action. It is believed that the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph, have been obviated, and their withdrawal therefore is respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 69-71, 73, 75-81, 83, and 85-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,552,813 (*Yacoub*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,337,745 (*Aiello, Jr. et al.*); and that Claims 72, 82, 90, and 91 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yacoub* in view of *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, and further in view of European Patent Application Publication No. 0 529 692 (*Murakami*). For at least the following reasons, Applicants submit that independent Claims 69, 79 and 89, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 69 is directed to an information processing apparatus for controlling, via a communication medium, a peripheral that

¹ Any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

processes a job, which executes a predetermined service. The apparatus includes an obtaining unit, a display unit, an issuance unit, and an inhibition unit. The obtaining unit obtains, via the communication medium, function information indicating plural values executable by the peripheral. The display unit displays a user interface provided in a control program for controlling the peripheral, based on the function information obtained by the obtaining unit.

Notably, the issuance unit issues a job provided with (i) plural setting values set via the user interface displayed by the display unit, the plural setting values including a value of a first attribute and a value of a second attribute different from the first attribute, and (ii) a reference pointer indicating a reference to data to be processed using the plural setting values. If the plural setting values of the job are determined not to satisfy a predetermined condition related to the plural values indicated by the function information obtained by the obtaining unit, the inhibition unit inhibits issuance of the job by the issuance unit. If setting of the value of the first attribute inhibits setting of the value of the second attribute, the inhibition unit determines that the job does not satisfy the predetermined condition provided with the plural setting values including the values of the first and second attributes. The issuance unit issues the job provided with the reference pointer indicating the reference to data in an external apparatus, without downloading the data to the information processing apparatus.

By virtue of the operation of the issuance unit, a user can set functions when instructing the peripheral to execute the job, for example. Moreover, because the data to be processed need not be downloaded by the information processing apparatus, even if the data is stored in an external apparatus, a user can promptly instruct the peripheral to execute the job, for example.

Yacoub is understood to relate to a virtual printer for print jobs printed on networked printers (see Abstract). *Yacoub* discusses that options for speed and quality can be presented for selection by a user, and that a server can find appropriate printers for each of these speed and quality settings, without the user making a selection (see col. 5, lines 22-27). *Yacoub* also discusses that, if a fast job is preferred and also a color job is preferred, only printers that are fast and that can print in color are determined as appropriate printers (see col. 5, lines 27-30).

Applicants agree with the conclusion in the Office Action that *Yacoub* fails to disclose an issuance unit adapted to issue a job provided with plural setting values including first and second attribute values (see Office Action, page 5). Moreover, nothing has been found in *Yacoub* that is believed to teach or suggest an issuance unit that is adapted to issue a job provided with a reference pointer indicating a reference to data in an external apparatus.

Aiello, Jr. et al. is understood to relate to a method for printing in which print jobs are routed automatically from source computers to printers (see Abstract). *Aiello, Jr. et al.* discusses that a print job can be received at a print server coupled to a Graphical User Interface (GUI) that includes a list of received print jobs (see col. 2, lines 26-29). The print job can be selected from the list of received print jobs, a determination can be made to determine if the printer coupled to the print server has a set-up compatible with a set-up of the selected print job, and the selected print job can be sent from the print server to an output manager connected to the printer (see col. 2, lines 29-34). Selecting of the print job can include dragging-and-dropping the print job from the list of received print jobs onto a printer icon (see col. 2, lines 34-36). The dragging-and-dropping of the print job can be prevented, if the set-up of the printer is determined to be incompatible with the set-up of the selected print job (see col. 2, lines 36-39).

Aiello, Jr. et al. also discusses that a Queue Manager can access header information of a print job to determine which print resources are required to print the job (*see* col. 5, lines 32-35). The Queue Manager can access a resource manager to determine whether the required print resources are available (*see* col. 5, lines 35-37). If a required print resource is not available, the Queue Manager notifies the operator through the GUI (*see* col. 5, lines 40 and 41).

Nothing has been found in *Aiello, Jr. et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest an issuance unit that is adapted to issue a job provided with plural setting values set via a user interface displayed by a display unit. Moreover, nothing has been found in *Aiello, Jr. et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest an issuance unit that is adapted to issue a job provided with a reference pointer indicating a reference to data to be processed using the plural setting values.

In summary, Applicants submit that a combination of *Yacoub* and *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest an information processing apparatus that includes “an issuance unit adapted to issue a job provided with (i) plural setting values set via the user interface displayed by the display unit, the plural setting values including a value of a first attribute and a value of a second attribute different from the first attribute, and (ii) a reference pointer indicating a reference to data to be processed using the plural setting values,” wherein “the issuance unit issues the job provided with the reference pointer indicating the reference to data in an external apparatus, without downloading the data to the information processing apparatus,” as recited in Claim 69. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 69 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 79 and 89 include features sufficiently similar to those of Claim 69 that these claims are believed to be patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in the present application depend from one or another of independent Claims 69, 79, and 89 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for responding to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 5145543_2